

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/526,499	DUFRESNE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	PATRICIA L. HAILEY	1793
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 M</u> . 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	action is non-final.	osecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		•
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/04/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Priority

Page 2

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Applicants' Priority Document was filed on March 4, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 lacks antecedent basis for the limitation "second step"; claim 1, from which claim 11 depends, does not recite a "second step".

Claim 12 (and claims 13-15, which depend from claim 12) lacks antecedent basis for the phrase "organic compound"; claim 1, from which claims 12-15 depend, does not recite this phrase.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 1793

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 7. Claims 1, 6-8, 11-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dufresne et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,922,638).

Dufresne et al. teach a process for ex-situ sulfurization of a catalyst, wherein the catalyst is brought into contact with a presulfurizing agent that contains elemental sulfur and an organic liquid, examples of which include gas oils and fatty acid triglycerides.

See col. 2, line 52 to col. 3, line 39 (considered to read upon claims 11-15, 18, and 20).

Application/Control Number: 10/526,499

Art Unit: 1793

After sulfurization, the catalyst may be subjected to ex-situ activation, followed by passivation treatment. This treatment can be carried out by passing an oxidized gas flow through the catalytic mass, or by impregnating the catalyst with a liquid that prevents the oxidation of sulfides at ambient temperatures (e.g., gas oils and lubricating bases such as a synthetic or mineral oil). See col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 13 of Dufresne et al. (considered to read upon claims 6 and 7), which also discloses that the catalyst is kept in motion during the activation stage, for example by carrying out activation in a rotary reactor tank (claim 8).

Example 1 of Dufresne et al. depicts an embodiment wherein a catalyst comprising CoO and MoO₃ is subjected to sulfurization (considered to read upon claims 16 and 19).

Although Dufresne et al. do not explicitly disclose an "ex situ oxidizing passivation" process, as instantly claimed, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Dufresne et al. by incorporating therein Patentees' passivation treatment, motivated by the teachings of Dufresne et al. that such a treatment can be performed on the presulfurized catalyst disclosed therein.

8. Claims 3-7, 9, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dufresne et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,922,638) as applied to claims 1, 6-8, 11-16, and 18-20 above, and further in view of Dufresne (U. S. Patent No. 6,059,956, Applicants' submitted art).

Application/Control Number: 10/526,499

Art Unit: 1793

Dufresne et al. is relied upon for its teachings with respect to claims 1, 6-8, and 11-16. Dufresne et al. do not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 3, 9, and 10.

Dufresne teaches a pretreatment or activation process for a hydrocarbon hydroconversion catalyst, involving off-site incorporation into the catalyst of at least one sulphuration agent and/or at least one other suitable solvent (e.g., a triglyceride of unsaturated fatty acids such as vegetable oils). See col. 2, line 13 to col. 3, line 4 of Dufresne (considered to read upon the "first step" of claim 3).

The process also involves off-site treatment with pure or diluted hydrogen under conditions such as fixed, mobile, expanded, or fluidized bed to maximize homogeneity in the distribution of the sulphuration agent (considered to read upon claims 9 and 10), and also ex situ passivation, wherein a stream of oxygen and/or a stream of air are passed over the catalyst (considered to read upon the "second step" of claim 3). Contact of the catalyst with oxygen may be made in two stages or several stages (considered to read upon claims 4-7; the partial pressures recited therein are considered to be process optimization parameters). See col. 3, lines 5-61 of Dufresne.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Dufresne et al. by incorporating therein the process of Dufresne, because the ex situ passivation disclosed by Dufresne eliminates the pyrophoric tendency of the catalyst's sulphide phases, and also positively affects the catalyst's activity. See col. 4, lines 40-44 of Dufresne.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record doe's not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 2.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PATRICIA L. HAILEY whose telephone number is (571)272-1369. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays, from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo, can be reached on (571) 272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 1700 Receptionist, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1700.

Art Unit: 1793

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/PATRICIA L. HAILEY/ Examiner, Art Unit 1793 February 15, 2008

/Jerry A Lorengo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793

Notice of References Cited Application/Control No. | Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination DUFRESNE ET AL. | Examiner | Art Unit | PATRICIA L. HAILEY | 1793 | Page 1 of 1 U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	Α	US-2,905,636 A	09-1959	WATKINS CHARLES H; et. al.	208/216R
*	В	US-5,094,991 A	03-1992	Lopez et al.	502/219
*	С	US-5,922,638 A	07-1999	Dufresne et al.	502/216
*	D	US-5,958,816 A	09-1999	Neuman et al.	502/38
*	E	US-6,100,216 A	08-2000	Dufresne et al.	502/219
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	Н	US-			
	-	US-	`.		
	7	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	М	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	0					
	Р	•				
	Q					
	R					
	s					
	Т			•		

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

	NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS						
*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)					
	Ū,						
	v						
	w						
	x						

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).) Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.



0 4 MAR 2005

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box +

PTO/SB/08A (08-00)

Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Complete if Known Substitute for form 1449A/PTO USNP of PCT/FR2004/000272 Application Number INFORMATION DISCLOSURE 6 February 2004 (6.02.2004) Filing Date STATEMENT BY APPLICANT Pierre DUFRESNE et al. First Named Inventor Group Art Unit Unassigned 1793 (use as many sheets as necessary) Examiner Name Unassigned Hailey PET-2164 Sheet of Attorney Docket Number

			U.S. F	ATENT DOCUMENTS		
Examiner Initials *	Cite No.1	U.S. Patent Document Kind Code Cite No.¹ Number (if known		Name of Patentee or Applicant of Cited Document	Date of Publication of Cited Documen MM-DD-YYYY	
/LH/	1	6059956		DUFRESNE PIERRE	May 9, 2000	
/LH/	2	6093309		PARTIN JOHN ALEXANDER ET AL.	July 25, 2000	
7LH/	3	2002000394		EIJSBOUTS SONJA	January 3, 2002	
/LH/	4	3838066		LOVELL L	September 24, 1974	
_						

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS								
Examiner Initials*	Cite No.	Foreign Patent Document			Date of Publication of	Pages, Columns, Lines, Where Relevant		
		Office ³	Number ⁴	Kind Code ³ (if known)	Name of Patentee or Applicant of Cited Document	Cited Document MM-DD-YYYY	Passages or Relevant Figures Appear	T⁵
								,,
						0		
	<u> </u>							

		D		
Examiner Signature	/Patricia Hailey/	Date Considered	02/14/2008	

EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 2.0 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Tredemark Office, Washington, DC 20231, DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

¹ Unique citation designation number, 2 See attached Kinds of U.S. Patent Documents, 3 Enter Office that issued the document, by the two-letter code (WIPO Standard ST.3). 4 For Japanese patent documents, the indication of the year of the reign of the Emperor must precede the serial number of the patent document. SKind of document by the appropriate symbols as indicated on the document under WIPO Standard ST, 16 if possible. Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language Translation is attached. Number refers to English language corresponding family member.

If Undeliverable Return in Ten Days Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 P.O. Box 1450

OFFICIAL BUSINESS PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

MALLED FROM ZIPCODE 25314

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER



